

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: December 6 and 13, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Kevin Nyhan, Christine Perron, Marc Laurin, Jon Evans, Charles Hood, Mark Hemmerlein, Peter Stamnas, Alex Vogt, Bob Landry, and Bill Watson, and Dave Silvia NHDOT; Edna Feighner, Beth Muzzey, Linda Wilson, and Nadine Peterson, NHDHR; Rich Roach, ACOE; Bill O'Donnell and Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Thom Marshall, SEA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Lisa Martin, Quantam Construction Consultants; Matt Low, HTA; Dori Thompson, Chief Financial Officer, Tri-County CAP; Andre Caron, Housing and Building Construction Manager, City of Berlin; George Turner, Architect for R&D Building Project; Jim Wagner, Chair of Parks and Androscoggin Valley Economic Development; Lisa Mausolf, Preservation, Consultant for R&D Building, Berlin; Kevin Gagne, FST; and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company, Consultant for Bennington.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Conway, HP-STP-DPI-MGS-TX-01, 11339B
Concord, X-A000(366), 14426
Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C
Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678
Antrim 15255 (no federal project number)
Lebanon-Hanover, X-A000(310), 14340
Deering-Antrim 14237 (no federal number)
Bartlett 14372 (no federal number).
Berlin's Federal Prison
Gilford M-314-10: District 3
Eaton 14168 (no federal number)
Londonderry 13015 (no federal number)
Hollis 15310 (no federal number)
Hampton Falls 13408B (no federal number)
Berlin, X-A000(055), 13845
Lebanon, X-A000(141), 13951
Manchester, X-A000(220), 14170
Bennington X-A000(341), 14401
Bartlett 14372 (no federal number)
Belmont-SP-1942-1

Thursday, December 6, 2007

Conway, HP-STP-DPI-MGS-TX-01, 11339B. Participant: Joyce McKay for Jeanne Doherty (pepsinh@verizon.net) and Michelle Rober (447-3729).

J. McKay reviewed the elevations of the proposed rear addition as well as the "foundation" on the edge of the property near the hospital. Beth Muzzey agreed to the design of the elevations as presented except for the cupola, which would make the building more visible from Route 16 and identify it as a barn when there was none on the property. The jerkins head roof or cut-off at each roof gable appeared acceptable. It was agreed that the foundation shown on the design plan is actually part of the landscaping. The outline of stones had some plantings in it and looks similar to other landscape elements on the property. So, this feature is not archaeologically sensitive.

B. Muzzey indicated that as the plans for the property are developed that SHPO would like to review rehabilitation of the Burtis House as well as changes to the addition's exterior and landscaping.

Concord, X-A000(366), 14426. Participant: Charles Hood.

C. Hood reviewed the potential impacts of the roundabout project at the intersection of Centre, Liberty, and Auburn Streets adjacent to White Park. It is a municipally managed project. He explained that although a gate was to be constructed as an entrance to the park, there would be no property taking. However, the project did need to take 1400 square feet from Dewey School, and a fence and bench would need to be moved. No survey on the property has been completed, and B. Muzzey requested an individual form for the school that would include a discussion of the associated landscape. She explained that the portion that would be taken, a portion of the schoolyard, might be a character-defining feature of the property. It was noted that White Park is listed on the National Register. The gate could be viewed as an enhancement to the park. The property at the northwest corner of the intersection of Centre and Auburn, which will also be impacted, would also need an individual form. The extent, nature of the architecture, number of resources, some historical background, and potential significance of the district that includes this dwelling should be included within the form.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participants: Marc Laurin and Pete Stamnas.

P. Stamnas mentioned that the Louis Berger Group (the consulting firm tasked by DOT with the writing of the Supplemental EIS) has been informed that it will need to sub out to another company any additional historic investigations that would be needed for the SEIS documentation. All agreed that for continuity purposes The Preservation Company would be an appropriate choice.

P. Stamnas presented an update on the Robert Armstrong House stabilization, which is about 50% complete. The barn and its foundation have been removed, the roof sheathing and some rafters in the ell were replaced and the roof was closed-in prior to the snowstorm. They are doing fascia work, adding an end wall to the ell, framing windows, etc. Alex Ray, the property owner, signed the easements for the Robert Armstrong property. Alex Ray has also redesigned his site plans for the Common Man property renovations so that now a large portion of the George Armstrong House will be saved from demolition. Basically only the garage area (western portion) will be removed. This change was met with hardy approval by DHR and appreciation of Mr. Ray's

commitment to historic preservation. The Department attended the Windham Planning Board meeting to support that the renovations of the Common Man property as they fit in with the I-93 reconstruction plans and coordination effort has been on-going with Mr. Ray throughout the process. Continued coordinating with the Windham Historic Commission is occurring.

In August 2008, the Department will be advertising the construction contract that will, in part, build the new northbound bridge over NH 111A and impact the Common Man property. P. Stamnas inquired whether the MOA would need to be amended because of the changes that have and will result as compared to what was documented in the FEIS. All agreed that there was no need, although B. O'Donnell stated that some documentation would be needed for FHWA's files. It was agreed that an effects memo signed by all would be appropriate. L. Wilson stated that it should point out how all the requirements have been fulfilled. J. McKay will write the memo.

Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Bob Landry.

The purpose of this meeting was to determine the need for a research design in the event that excavation unearths significant archaeological deposits. Previous discussion with J. McKay indicated that this step was necessary. However, after further discussion with E. Feighner, it was determined that such a research design would not be necessary, as long as sufficient time would be provided during construction should excavation unearth such artifacts. Bob Landry indicated that most of the areas that required excavation were fill or had already undergone disturbance.

Antrim 15255 (no federal project number). Participant: Lisa Martin, Quantum Construction Consultants (lmartin@quantum-cc.com).

Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC (QCC) was contracted by the Town of Antrim for the design of a replacement bridge structure on North Main Street. The existing concrete arch is believed to have been constructed in 1914. The concrete arch and stone retaining walls are severely deteriorated, have sustained damage by floods, and are in need of replacement.

QCC presented a bridge plan, which include elevations and sections showing the proposed 12-foot wide box culvert with streambed material in the bottom of the box. QCC stated that as part of the NHDES Wetland Bureau application, QCC received a designation of "No Known Historical Resource" from the NH State Historic Preservation Officer. QCC scheduled to attend this meeting because the project was recently approved for funding through the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Aid Program.

Peter Pitsas of Underwood Engineers, Inc. (UE) discussed the roadway design for North Main Street. The limits of work extend approximately 175 feet east and 250 feet west of the culvert along North Main Street. The road will be raised at the bridge to allow for sewer, drainage, and water lines to cross above the new box structure. A sidewalk is being provided on the proposed bridge. It is the Town's intent to add a sidewalk down the length of North Main Street from Rt. 31 to Smith Road. It is uncertain if it will be constructed as part of the bridge replacement project.

After inspection of the photographs presented by QCC, B. Muzzey determined that the existing concrete structure may be historically significant and that an Individual Inventory Form must be completed. It was also determined that no surveys are required to take place on adjacent

properties, as they will not be adversely affected by the project. This discussion represented the beginning of the Section 106 process.

QCC will hire a consultant to review the history of the structure and complete the required Individual Inventory Form and will follow up with the SHPO committee, should the structure be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Lebanon-Hanover, X-A000(310), 14340. Participant: Christine Perron.

An overview of this project was given. The project will involve resurfacing, minor drainage improvements, guardrail replacements, and additions along NH Route 10 beginning 350 feet south of Fountain Way in Lebanon and proceeding north 2.9 miles to 200 feet north of Brook Street in Hanover. All work will be in the right-of-way. It was agreed that the project would not impact any cultural resources and a No Historic Properties Affected memo was signed. This discussion represented the beginning of the Section 106 process.

Deering-Antrim 14237 (no federal number). Participants: Rich Roach, ACOE; Thom Marshall (Thomas.Marshall@seacon.com) and Nate Boudreau, S E A Consultants; and Craig Ohlson, Town of Deering.

SEA handed out a meeting agenda, which included a background and history of the project to date. SEA had already begun the Section 106 process at previous meetings. The West Deering Road Bridge over the Contoocook River (032/101) was built in 1905 as a single lane, single span, low Warren truss, which has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with a score of 21. Rich Roach suggested that the history of what has happened thus far be skipped, and he presented his thoughts on the replacement of the existing truss, with a new two-lane bridge.

R. Roach felt that there was sufficient evidence to support a complete replacement of the existing truss with a new two lane bridge and felt that proceeding with the Town's preferred solution (Alternate 4A) was appropriate. He recommended that the mitigation efforts for replacing the bridge consist of storing the trusses and advertising them for some finite period of time. He also mentioned completing HAER documentation and constructing some type of memorial at the site.

B. Muzzey and L. Wilson were not in agreement with the replacement alternate and mitigation as spelled out by R. Roach. B. Muzzey agreed that the one lane alternates (Alternates 1 and 3) did not seem practical, however setting aside the bridge without a specific plan creates later problems and this alternative would be a last resort. This bridge should serve a specific purpose whether left on site or move to another location. DHR's order of preference of the two lane alternatives was as follows:

- 1) Alternate 2 – Rehabilitate the old bridge structure and widen it. It was understood that rehabilitation would not completely preserve the truss as new members would need to be added to the structure. This alternate would have a higher construction cost, increased long-term maintenance costs and a lower structural capacity.
- 2) Alternate 4B – Construct a bypass and rehabilitate the old structure in its current location while ensuring that it will remain in use for pedestrian or snowmobile traffic.

- 3) Alternate 4A – The complete replacement alternate would require an extensive marketing effort to find an alternative use/location for the trusses. Such a marketing effort would need to be accompanied by a periodic report on this effort. DHR's preference was to have the trusses rehabilitated with an actual plan in place for reusing them as opposed to storing the trusses and advertising them over a certain timeframe. R. Roach stated that he would not agree to any language in the MOA that is subjective and not enforceable. L. Wilson suggested that the Town and S E A develop a list of potential mitigation alternatives for further discussion and review if this alternate is to be pursued.

C. Ohlson and T. Marshall stated that the added expense of rehabilitating the truss and reconstructing it at another site was problematic as the town was already struggling with covering the cost for the Town's preferred alternate (4A), which is the least expensive two-lane alternate at an estimated project cost of \$900,000 (without the added mitigation costs). Alternate 4B is estimated at \$1,200,000 without the additional mitigation costs associated with rehabilitating the truss. Alternate 2 has an estimated project cost of \$1,500,000. Due to financial constraints, the Town would have to digest the information that was discussed at this meeting and further evaluate how they would like to proceed.

E. Feighner stated that an archaeological survey would be needed for any off-line work at the site, specifically a combined phase 1A & 1B. It was noted that the adjacent older buildings were set well away from the bridge and would not be affected by the replacement.

Bartlett 14372 (no federal number). Participants: Mark Hemmerlein, Charlie Hood, and Steve Liakos.

M. Hemmerlein stated that Rep. Chandler had most recently begun requesting that NHDOT remove the truss in 2005. He indicated that the Section 106 process had begun when NHDOT first presented the removal at a Cultural Resources meeting. B. Muzzey requested that NHDOT note in the minutes when it was beginning the Section 106 process. The public meeting when members of the community were invited to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties was held on September 18, 2006. That meeting generated sixty-five letters, fifteen wished to preserve the bridge and fifty wished to demolish it. However, there had been no request for consulting party status within this correspondence. In April 2007, FHWA had conferred with its legal council about the 4(f) statement, and it had agreed that the statement was sufficient. However, the Department of Interior did not concur with the 4(f) statement. DOI had suggested that rather than removal, the bridge should be retained as an asset and become a destination with a pull out and sign. Jim Garvin had also posed a series of questions about the 4(f) statement, and B. Muzzey requested a formal, written response. FHWA notified the Advisory Council. At the time of the Council's response in August, it did not request to be involved. To date, the adverse effect memo has not been signed, and there has been no agreement on mitigation for the removal of the bridge.

Beth Muzzey indicated that NHDHR had recently met with Charlene Vaughn of the Advisory Council, and the later indicated that the Council might re-open the Section 106 process. C. Vaughn indicated that the timeline for the beginning of the Section 106 process appeared to be unclear. Bill O'Donnell commented that the Section 106 process began when the project was first presented at a Cultural Resources meeting. The minutes serve to document that process. C.

Vaughn had also indicated that without added documentation, it appeared as if the NHDOT had not fully developed alternatives to the bridge removal.

B. Muzzey indicated that Jim Garvin had put together a list of mitigation possibilities, which was only in draft form. Marketing the bridge, its documentation, and placing a state historic marker at the site were not sufficient mitigation for the loss of the bridge. She reiterated that the DHR was having further conversations with the Council. B. Muzzey also stated that the project was setting a precedent concerning the treatment of other by-passed bridges, which was the larger problem. The proposed mitigation fails to provide public benefit equivalent for the loss of the bridge.

M. Hemmerlein asked if DHR would sign the adverse effect memo, which did not indicate the mitigation. B. Muzzey agreed. She requested in turn a formal response to J. Garvin's questions about 4(f) statement for this project. In verbal response to those questions, M. Hemmerlein noted that the mitigation for the bridge needed to be separated from the larger issues. He indicated that re-evaluation of the eligibility of the historic bridge types was underway as resources allowed. The creation of a historic bridge plan is an on-going issue. Some eligible bridges have been retained in service when possible. Title has been retained to most by-passed bridges. He stated that the agreements made to retain such historic bridges as the North Walpole Bellows Falls Bridge and the two Bascule bridges remain in effect and are valid. Aid for historic municipal bridge was provided in a ratio of 20%-80% municipal and state respectively. The provision to create a storage yard for historic trusses had not been supported by Jim Moore, but the concept would be explored. The ability to carry out this request was limited by the cost of removing the bridge from the site and transporting it to the yard.

Thursday, December 13, 2007

Berlin's Federal Prison. Participant: Jamie Paine.

This meeting was held to allow the State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO, NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR)] an opportunity to review and comment on the City of Berlin's proposal to provide necessary underground utilities to the new Federal prison currently under construction in Berlin. This review is required to satisfy Federal and State regulations associated with obtaining wetlands permits for this project.

Project Description

The City of Berlin is to provide utilities (e.g., sewer and water lines) to the property line of the new Federal Prison located on East Milan Road, from the existing Berlin Water Works facility on East Milan Road to the Prison entrance. The proposed project is required to provide essential services to the new Federal Prison property, a rural, forested site, currently under development. The utilities would predominantly be located immediately adjacent to the west side of the roadway and traverse approximately 6,000 linear feet. A brook, Horne Brook, is proposed to be crossed using an open V-ditch and burying the utilities under the brook, with Best Management Practices (BMPs) in place.

The proposed project would result in little to no permanent terrain change through most of the project area. Outlets to three culverts that run underneath East Milan Road will be reshaped to prevent winter pipe blockages and provide swales, where tight walled outlets exist. The utility corridor crosses one brook, Horne Brook. This brook location is the site of an existing NHDOT bridge rehabilitation project, which required placement of rip-rap in the brook and banks for

bridge stabilization/protection. The rip-rap has not been placed yet, and it is the City's intent to place utilities at the same location, before the rip-rap is placed, minimizing disturbance.

NHDHR Determination

Edna Feighner reviewed the project and felt that based on review of previous projects in the area, the north and south ends of this project were clear of concerns, but she felt that that a small middle section in a wooded location from Horne Brook south approximately 500 to 1000 feet in length may not have been reviewed for archaeological resources. She felt that as the project would bury utilities predominantly along the roadway, no review for historical resources is required.

Ms. Feighner stated that Monadnock Archaeological Consulting reviewed the north end of the project for a private development (across from the entrance to the Federal Prison). *Subsequent to the meeting, Dr. Robert Goodby of Monadnock Archaeological Consulting reported that "while the results from our work in 2006 do not suggest a high likelihood of sites being present in the area..., it's important to note that we did not examine this area specifically." With this information, Ms. Feighner requested shovel tests occur in the forested area in the APE adjacent to Horne Brook and an end of field letter reporting the findings must be provided to NHDHR.*

Gilford M-314-10: District 3. Participant: Dave Silvia

J. McKay and Lane Evans reviewed a stone culvert located on Route 11 over a perennial stream in the Town of Gilford. District 3 planned to replace the 2' X 3' X 40' culvert with a 36" X 50" reinforced concrete pipe. Because the inlet end had been modified with a metal culvert extension in the 1950s and the outlet end was damaged during the flood of October 2005 and quickly repaired, Linda Wilson found that the structure now lacked integrity and was not potentially eligible for the National Register. No further documentation will be needed. [J. McKay subsequently notified Rich Roach of L. Wilson's findings.]

Eaton 14168 (no federal number). Participants: Matt Low (mlow@hta-nh.com) and Jason Lodge, HTA.

Hoyle, Tanner presented the Potter Road Bridge (072/137) project that is currently in the Engineering Study Phase. Matthew J. Low, P.E., SECB provided an introduction of the project. The bridge was erected in 1970 as an I-Beam bridge with wood plank deck. The project is under the Comprehensive Shoreline Protection Act.

J. Lodge described the project in more detail. This discussion included straightening the alignment with a 4-foot to 6-foot widening. Alignment improvement includes holding the location of the westerly abutment and changing the skew of the proposed bridge. The proposed bridge will be a concrete deck beam bridge on concrete abutments.

E. Feighner stated that archaeological sites are known to exist adjacent to Lake Conway, and requested that a consultant be retained to conduct testing of any areas outside the existing disturbed limits. The investigations should begin at the Phase IA/IB level. If archaeological deposits are found, these investigations may include additional phases, potentially a Phase II and a Phase III investigation. It was noted that there was one abutter whose dwelling was far removed from the site of the bridge.

L. Wilson wondered about the stone abutments. She requested that the Town reuse the stone elsewhere. E. Muzzey determined there were no above ground concerns, but archaeological concerns must be addressed.

Londonderry 13015 (no federal number). Participants: Alex Vogt and Kevin Nyhan.

Alex Vogt discussed this project, which begins approximately 0.17 miles (900 ft) south of the NH Route 128 intersection with Stonehenge and Litchfield Roads, and runs northerly approximately 0.35 miles (1800 ft). This project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 128 and Stonehenge, Litchfield and Bartley Hill Roads because of poor sight distance and prevalent accident history at the intersection. The intersection will be reconfigured and signalized. The work includes the addition of turn lanes, shoulders, and a stone box culvert replacement. A. Vogt indicated that an abutting property owner, whose house is historic, requested that the Department construct a fence along his roadway frontage. The construction would be white vinyl. Beth Muzzey indicated that this would not be an historic resource impact as the fence is not permanent.

A question came up regarding the stone box culvert that carries Little Cohas Brook under NH Route 128. B. Muzzey asked if it was ever surveyed. It had not. As such, Beth indicated that a survey would be required, depending on its current condition. K. Nyhan indicated that he would provide photographs of the culvert to J. McKay so that the determination could be made whether to survey it. It was also determined that the project would still have the same level of historic resource effect: No Historic Properties Affected.

[Subsequent to the meeting on January 2, 2008, B. Muzzey requested an individual inventory form for the culvert.]

Hollis 15310 (no federal number). Participants: Jon Evans.

J. Evans stated that this project involves the repair or replacement of a culvert on Depot Road in Hollis, NH. This 6-foot wide by 7-foot high stone box culvert is located approximately 1,800 feet north of the Depot Road, NH Route 111 intersection. This culvert was damaged during the floods of April 2007, resulting in severe structural deficiencies and apparent safety concerns. Reconstruction of this culvert may require the roadway to be temporarily closed and traffic detoured onto local roads a distance of approximately 2 miles around the work zone.

J. Evans noted that since this culvert is presumed eligible for the National Register, this project would likely have an adverse effect on the structure. B. Muzzy agreed that this project would have an adverse effect on the structure and therefore would require an Adverse Effect Memo. J. McKay noted that she reviewed this project with members of NHDHR prior to bringing the project to the monthly meeting, and it was agreed that mitigation would be in the form of large format photos and written documentation performed by NHDOT staff. The photos were reviewed by B. Muzzy and were found to be acceptable along with the proposed mitigation.

J. Evans clarified that this project does not have any FHWA funds however a wetlands permit will be necessary. B. Muzzy indicated that since a wetlands permit was necessary, Section 106 would likely apply. J. Evans asked if there were any alternatives to going through the entire Section 106 process for small projects such as this one where no viable alternatives were available. B. Muzzy indicated that unfortunately for this culvert there are no alternatives to going

through the complete Section 106 process and the Department would have to develop an MOA and coordinate with the Advisory Council on consulting party status. She also indicated that in the future the Department with the appropriate federal agencies could develop a programmatic agreement with NHDHR and the Advisory Council, which would allow the Department to conduct standard mitigation to fulfill the Section 106 process and generally avoid preparation of the MOA and coordination with the Advisory Council. An Adverse Effect Memo was signed.

Hampton Falls 13408B (no federal number). Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Bob Landry.

The project involves the rehabilitation of the bridge, dam w/fish ladder, and overflow structure that carry Interstate 95 over the Taylor River between Hampton and Hampton Falls. This discussion clarified previous presentations and detailed the alternative that was supported at the Public Informational Meeting: Reconstruction of the dam, bridge and fish ladder. At previous meetings, it was determined that the bridge, fish ladder and overflow structure were not eligible for the National Register given the materials from which they were constructed and the lack of significant engineering considerations associated with the construction. It was determined at that previous meeting that as long as the water level in the impoundment would not change archaeological investigation would not be required. This is still the case. A memo can be signed indicating that as long as the project proceeds as the replacement of the dam, there will be No Historic Properties Affected.

Berlin, X-A000(055), 13845. Participants: Dori Thompson, Chief Financial Officer, Tri-County Cap; Andre Caron, Housing/Building Reconstruction Manager, City of Berlin; George Turner, Project Architect and Business Manager (george@rivertowndesign.com); Jim Wagner, Chair of Park and Androscoggin Valley Economic Development; Bill Watson, NHDOT; Nadine Peterson, DHR; Lisa Mausolf, Preservation Consultant; and Mike Winsatt, NHDES.

The team from the Northern Forest Heritage Park presented a progress report on work done for the Brown Company Research Building in Berlin. Jim Wagner provided a summary of the project history and background. George Turner presented a power point overview of the project. He reviewed the proposed improvements to the building. It was noted that Judy Selwyn should be contacted in regard to materials science, window restoration, etc. Note that the piece supported by Scenic Byways money includes the exhibit.

The consultant team for the project includes George Turner, AIA Architect; Lisa Mausolf, Architectural Historian; Ed Bergeron, PE HEB Engineering for civil and structural engineering; Doug Evelyn, cultural facilities and museum operation; and John Saydek, ASLA and S. Plunkard, ASLA, Stantec, Inc, Landscape Architects;

Lisa Mausolf, Preservation Consultant for the project, addressed the status of Section 106 activities. She stated that she had initially prepared an inventory form for the Research Buildings back in November 2001 under contract with GZA GeoEnvironmental who was engaged in some environmental work at the time. The building was determined eligible for the National Register at the time, under Criterion A. The documentation of the building as part of the present project is currently underway. The center section (addition) was documented with large format

photographs and DHR reviewed the images prior to the demolition. These photographs will be incorporated into the overall documentation package.

As per discussions with Nadine Peterson at DHR, the building will be documented at a State Level, using the State Level Historic Properties Documentation outline format. DHR has requested that the historical context consider several key issues including the research conducted at the facility and how it related to a national context; the role women played in the workforce; workplace safety initiatives that the company may have formulated; the relationship between the building and the main plant; hierarchies expressed in the building design; the equipment housed in the building; the relationship between the building design and the research conducted; and the place of the building within the context of modern fireproof/reinforced concrete construction in the state in the early 20th century. The original design plans still need to be photographically copied in large format. There are currently 30-4X5 views of the building.

There was some discussion about the potential significance of the structure architecturally under Criterion C and how this merited further investigation, particularly the early use of reinforced concrete beam and columns. The building appears to represent a transitional structure as well as an early example of a “daylight” building. DHR staff offered suggestions for comparison and additional information.

Additional discussions noted that the building’s roof had been leaking. Ed Bergeron is in the process of designing a new temporary roof structure to span over the existing roof and bear on the sidewalls. This should be detailed in such a way as to allow work to occur on the building parapets. The dropped ceiling would need to be removed. Thus, what stays and what is removed needs to be identified and the impact of this action on the historical integrity of the building would need careful consideration. [Additional discussion occurred regarding this point with Andre Caron following the meeting. Lisa Mausolf and George Turner will advise Andre Caron concerning the contributing historic fabric vs. the modern additions so that the later can continue to remove unnecessary materials from the building.]

The remediation of hazardous materials was also discussed. GZA completed a survey of the R&D Building in 2001. Sanborn Head is the current contractor. Remediation for PCB’s, which are present in several areas of the building, may involve scarification of the concrete. Artifacts would need to be removed and washed down to remove hazardous substances. While the windows would be left, lead paint should be removed from them.

Dorrie Thompson of Tri-County Cap reviewed the status of the project funding. The Scenic Byways funding included \$304,000. It was mentioned that the property might be eligible at the national level, making Preserve America and Save American’s Treasure’s grants a possibility. It was also suggested that the National Center for Preservation and Training and the APT network be contacted for questions dealing with the history of technology and potential treatments.

Beth Muzzey indicated that since this is a Section 106 project, consulting parties should be notified through, for example, a public meeting.

Next steps included further documentation of the historical resources associated with the building and review of the effects of building stabilization. If adverse effects were unavoidable, then a MOA would need to spell out the mitigation. As currently planned, the project should not be adverse to the character defining features of the building. NHDHR requested review of the plans as they develop and coordination on a regular basis.

Lebanon, X-A000(141), 13951. Participants: Jon Evans.

J. Evans stated that the project was previously discussed on April 5, 2007 and an Adverse Effect Memo was signed on April 12, 2007 for impacts to the bridge. This project involves the replacement of the US Route 4 Bridge over the Mascoma River in Enfield, NH. The limits of work for this project extend along US Route 4 approximately 1,200 feet west and 1,800 feet east of the NH Route 4A intersection. Work will extend along NH Route 4A for a distance of approximately 700 feet. This project will also include the installation of a modern roundabout at the intersection of US Route 4 and NH Route 4A. The need for this project is indicated by structural deficiencies throughout the length of the entire structure. These deficiencies have necessitated that this bridge be placed on the State Red List, indicating enough inadequate structural conditions to warrant more frequent inspections.

J. McKay indicated that the archaeological investigation had been completed, and no archaeological sites were located.

J. Evans indicated that there would likely be impacts to parcels 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20 & 21. The structures on these parcels were reviewed by J. McKay and NHDHR, and none of them were determined to be potentially eligible for the National Register. J. Evans also indicated that the existing and proposed structures pass over the remnants of the Northern Railroad Corridor, which is now a recreational trail. It was noted that the southern pier of the proposed bridge would be placed between the river and the trail similar to the existing bridge. There will also be temporary impacts to the corridor during construction, however the trail will remain open to the general public. These impacts were reviewed at the April 5, 2007 meeting, and it was agreed that the project would not have an adverse effect on the Northern Railroad. B. O'Donnell noted that since the adverse effect is on the bridge only and not the Northern Railroad Corridor the project would qualify for a Programmatic 4(f).

J. Evans also noted that there is a town owned recreational trail known as the Mill Road Municipal Trail on the southwestern side of the existing bridge (parcel 12). Temporary impacts to this trail are expected to allow access to the underside of the bridge. Some permanent impacts to this property may be necessary to stabilize the slope between Mill Road and US Route 4. B. O'Donnell indicated that these would be considered 4(f) impacts unless the Department could get a statement from the town indicating that this trail is not a significant recreational resource. He further clarified that if the town felt that this was a significant recreational resource, and they confirmed that the project would not have an adverse effect on the activities, features, and attributes of the trail, then the Department could obtain a *De Minimis* 4(f) finding for impacts to the recreational trail.

Manchester, X-A000(220), 14170. Participants: Jon Evans.

J. Evans indicated that this project involves the replacement of the Island Pond Road Bridges over Interstate 93 in Manchester, NH. This project begins at the Cohas Ave. intersection and proceeds east along Island Pond Road, approximately 1,000 feet to the East Industrial Park Drive intersection. In addition to the bridge replacements, a sound barrier will be constructed along the southbound side of Interstate 93 to the east of the Pinebrook Place and Cranwell Drive neighborhoods. The need for the bridge portion of this project is indicated by safety and structural deficiencies throughout the length of the entire structure. The Island Pond Road

bridges are listed on the Department's Red List due to severe superstructure deficiencies. The sound barrier will be constructed to protect the Pinebrook Place and Cranwell Drive neighborhoods from high noise levels emitted from Interstate 93.

J. Evans and J. McKay noted that the bridges were constructed in 1961 and are ineligible for listing on the National Register as they pass over Interstate 93 and were reviewed for eligibility along with the rest of the Interstate System. J. Evans noted that the structure on Parcel 43, to the southeast of the bridges has a stone foundation, however it was newly renovated with vinyl siding, new windows and a new porch. B. Muzzy indicated that if the property were to be impacted a form front would need to be developed to determine the structure's eligibility. R. Landry stated that the property would not be impacted at all (temporary, permanent or otherwise) and asked why a form front was needed. B. Muzzy stated that if the property would not be impacted, then a form front was not necessary and a No Historic Properties Affected Memo could be signed. A No Historic Properties Affected Memo was signed by NHDHR and FHWA.

Bennington X-A000(341), 14401. Participants: Kevin Gagne, FST (kgagne@fstinc.com) and Lynne Monroe.

K. Gagne provided a project introduction:

- This Transportation Enhancement project is intended to improve pedestrian safety in Bennington Village.
- To date, FST has conducted an abutter's meeting, two public comment/input meetings, and several working Select Board meetings to identify the problems, present potential concepts, and arrive at a consensus master concept plan for the study area.
- Approximate construction costs for the study area was developed by FST and discussed with the Select Board. A consensus was reached as to what would become the boundaries of Phase 1 of the project, and what elements from the master plan would be included. A plan was shown indicating the limits of this Phase 1. Other areas, shown as Phase 2A and Phase 2B, could be brought to final design as part of a future project, but would not be designed or constructed as part of this project.
- In the project master concept plan, existing sidewalks would be replaced in some areas and new sidewalks added in others. Crosswalk locations would be evaluated and re-established.
- Existing drainage would be upgraded and replaced along with the addition of new catch basins and drain lines as necessary.
- Many areas of the master concept plan include the reduction of existing pavement, improvement of turning radii, and the addition of open/green spaces in front of properties, and at key locations such as "monument square," "firehouse square," and "triangle square."
- Street trees would likely be included, while lighting appears out of budget. Sleeves for future lighting would likely be installed under driveways and sidewalks as necessary. K. Gagne provided an overview

L. Monroe discussed her preliminary findings related to the Historic District Area:

- Bennington is an industrial village with visible early pedestrian activity including sidewalks, crosswalks and lighting
- L. Monroe completed a district area form for the village, and the project occurs in the center of the district.

- Granite posts, picket fences, and granite bollards were prominently used materials in the streetscape through time.
- Public spaces were named, such as “Monument Square,” “Liberty Square,” “Firehouse Square,” and “Triangle Square”.
- The monument at Liberty Square (formerly corner of Cross/Main) was moved to what is now “Monument Square” at the SE corner of Francetown Rd. and Main.
- A bandstand was formerly located at Monument Square, as well as the watering trough (that is still there).

K. Gagne provided detailed information regarding the evolution of concepts resulting in property impact/work outside the roadway R.O.W. (safety reasons, general improvements) at several locations as follows:

- Library area – shifting of sidewalk towards library to provide adequate travel lane and parking lane dimensions; intent is not to require a change in the library granite steps
- Schnare property – increasing turn radii to prevent trucks from riding the sidewalk (serious pedestrian safety issue involving school children) and/or encroaching on opposite travel lane; possible impact to 1 or 2 granite post/fence sections which would be reset at new back of sidewalk; possibility that fence would need to be removed and reset (original location) during re-construction of sidewalk along School Street.
- Monument Square – improved turn radius on corner impacts a sliver of property on Francetown Road side, while expanding potential plaza area on Main St. side of the corner. This Town-supported change results in a net increase in the area of the “square.” Discussed possibility of alternate surface texture to differentiate “plaza” area from sidewalk. Consensus was that all concrete (perhaps “exposed aggregate”) would be appropriate, while cobble or granite were also possibilities. If alternate texture were selected for the Cross/Main St. area (old “Liberty Square”), it would be important to utilize the same treatment as selected for the Monument Square plaza.
- Cement concrete sidewalks are most appropriate for the project, perhaps with an exposed aggregate finish.
- Granite Bollards around “squares” (outside of roadway clear zones) would be an appropriate aesthetic addition.
- Drainage includes replacement of existing pipes and structures, and the addition of new pipes/structures.

CRG indicated that at the next meeting for the project:

- The project drainage system should be presented. Areas should be highlighted that differentiate the replacement of existing drainage from the addition of new drainage. A determination will be made as to whether there is any concern for archaeological impact related to drainage installation.
- It was called to FST’s attention that impacts to both historic properties and significant “parks” (monument square) would trigger “Section 4f.” It would be possible that a finding of “de minimis impact” could be made if proper documentation could be provided such as letter(s) from Town in support.

K. Gagne obtained Jamie Sikora (Area Engineer, Federal Highway Administration) contact information to further discuss 4f requirements.

Bartlett 14372 (no federal number). Mark Hemmerlein and Charles Hood.

B. Muzzey briefly discussed her conversation with Jeff Brillhart concerning mitigation for the Bartlett Bridge. In general, she did not feel that progress had been made in historic bridge evaluation and planning. Such planning could form a significant part of the mitigation for the Bartlett Bridge. They also spoke about the rehabilitation of the deck and bottom chord of the Boscowen-Canterbury bridge for snowmobile use and the rehabilitation of the bridge in Shelburne as possible approaches to mitigation. They did not, however, come to any specific conclusions.

B. O'Donnell noted that FHWA found no procedural problems with the 4(f) statement. The Advisory Council had reluctantly agreed to its removal in August. However, DOI had not concurred with the 4(f). He requested Beth to sign to Adverse Effect Memo and then collectively try to reach an agreement about the appropriate mitigation. The memo was signed.

Removing the bridge to another location was briefly discussed. M. Hemmerlein indicated that he had discussed its reuse with DRED without success.

Further discussion concerning mitigation took place.

M. Hemmerlein indicated that the creation of a storage yard for historic bridges to provide time for the determination of bridge reuse had been examined and one place had been pursued. Unfortunately, the district wanted the property for another use. To date, those arrangements have not been made. Conducting interpretation at the truss bridges on Route 302 in Bethlehem and Bath was also discussed. Creation of a bridge preservation plan based on the bridges that had already been inventoried was noted. Eric Delony had offered to assist in such an effort. His original offer is unclear, but he appears to have suggested holding a conference to establish the format for such a plan. A plan might be based on those historic bridges involved in the Ten Year Plan rather than doing the plan by bridge type.

[Subsequent to the meeting, it was agreed between J. Brillhart and B. Muzzey that the NHDHR would not object to the removal of the bridge if the NHDOT included in the MOA the commitment to prepare a preservation plan for the High Pratt Truss bridges following the completion of the bridge inventory update for the high Pratt trusses, update the historic bridge inventory for historic bridge types reviewed in the 1980s and early 1990s, and as funding permits commit to completing a bridge preservation plans for these bridge types.]

Belmont-SP-1942-1. Participant: Matt Urban

Matt Urban presented a 29-acre parcel that was originally acquired by the state in 1942 as a gravel pit. The parcel is located off of Brown Hill Rd via Rte 107, near the Belmont and Gilmanton town line. This parcel is heavily used as recreation source that has been permitted to have state maintained ATV trails. The eastern edge of the parcel has a perennial stream and some wetlands. E. Feighner's review determined that the parcel was unlikely sensitive for archaeological resources given its location and past history. No architectural resources would be impacted. The sale of this parcel can proceed.

****Memos/MOA's:** Bartlett 14372; Manchester, X-A000(220), 14170; Hollis 15310; Keene-Surrey, STP-X-000S(387), 13338; Lebanon-Hanover, X-A000(310),14340; Antrim, STP-TE-A000(556), 14828; Dover, STP-TE-X-5125(023).

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager